y

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION.NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,736	10/24/2003	Jianwei Yuan	5552550050I I	2401

7590 03/12/2007		EXAMINER
David B. Cochran, Esq.		NGUYEN, CHAU T
JONES DAY		
North Point		ART UNIT / PAPER NUMBER
901 Lakeside Ave		
Cleveland, OH 44114		2176

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>11 January 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7-10,17-26,28-32,34-36 and 38* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7-10,17-26,28-32,34-36 and 38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 October 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Amendment filed on 01/11/2007 has been entered. Claims 1-5, 7-10, 17-26, 28-32, 34-36 and 38 are presented for examination. Claims 6, 11-16, 27, 33, 37 and 39 are canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1-5, 9-10, 28, 30-32, and 35-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reiley et al. (Reiley), US Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0016801.

4.   As to independent claims 1 and 10, Reiley discloses a computer implemented method of generating summary information for an electronic document for use by a mobile communication device, comprising:

analyzing a content structure or properties within an electronic document (page 2, paragraph [0015]: parsing a web document (electronic document) to

create a data structure comprised of hierarchical organization of elements and conducting analysis of elements in the data structure);

generating document summary information includes an assemblage of a plurality of summary entries selected from the contents of the electronic document based on the analysis of the content structure or properties (page 6, paragraph [0065], page 7, paragraphs [0082]-[0083], page 8, paragraph [0089] and page 9, paragraph [0110]: after the analysis is complete, the content of the web document is passed to the transformer, which then reorganizes, summarizes, and removes information, where appropriate, from the hierarchical structure);

wherein said generating document summary information includes determining if the electronic document has a predetermined content structure and in response selecting the plurality of summary entries from the electronic document based on the predetermined content structure (page 2, paragraph [0017]: a content transformer transforms a Web document by performing an analysis of the elements of the Web document, the analysis taking into account a structural arrangement of the elements, and rearranges (summaries) the elements as a result of the analysis to generate a hierarchical data structure that represents the web document), and generates a user device format version of the web document based upon the hierarchical data structure; page 7, paragraph [0082]: the hierarchical structure represents a general summary or table of contents for the content of the web document (electronic document)); and

otherwise, if the electronic document has content properties, selecting the plurality of summary entries from the electronic document based on differences in the content properties (page 3, paragraphs [0038]-[0041]: the web page (electronic document) is divided into several elements including headings, paragraphs, lists, separators, graphics, tables, table item, etc...and these are content properties, and the transformer uses analysis rule to categorize the elements; page 7, paragraph [0083]: the content transformer divides the content into discrete data pieces or fragments, the data pieces or organized (summarized) according to the transformed hierarchy, i.e., discrete piece of data could be a page of text that corresponds to a level from the transformed hierarchy, wherein the text represents a portion of the original web page);

providing the document summary information for a mobile communication device (Fig. 1 and page 9, paragraphs [0110]-[0111]: when the transformer completes its process, it passes the newly-structured hierarchical structure to a device specific generator which takes the hierarchical structure and generates content that is configured to be displayed on the user device 100 (mobile communication device)).

5.   As to dependent claims 2 and 30, Reiley discloses wherein the act of analyzing the content structure or properties comprises identifying a table of contents in the electronic document (page 7, paragraphs [0082]-[0089]: the uppermost level of the hierarchical structure represents a general summary or table of contents).

6.   As to dependent claims 3 and 31, Reiley discloses wherein the act of analyzing the content structure or properties comprises identifying a plurality of spreadsheet worksheets in the electronic document (page 3, paragraphs [0038]-[0039] and page 5, paragraph [0057]).

7.   As to dependent claims 4 and 32, Reiley discloses wherein the act of analyzing the content structure or properties comprises identifying a plurality of document pages in the electronic document (page 3, paragraphs [0038]-[0039]).

8.   As to dependent claim 5, Reiley discloses wherein the act of analyzing the content structure or properties comprises analyzing text formatting in the electronic document (pages 5-6, paragraphs [0063]-[0067]).

9.   As to dependent claim 9, Reiley discloses wherein the summary information is provided to the mobile communication device without the electronic document (page 6, paragraph [0074] and page 7, paragraph [0082]).

10.   As to independent claim 28, Reiley discloses a server for generating summary information for electronic documents, comprising:

        a structured document summarization process which generates summary information by selecting a plurality of summary entries from an electronic document based on a predetermined content structure identified in the electronic

document (page 2, paragraph [0015]: parsing a web document (electronic document) to create a data structure comprised of hierarchical organization of elements and conducting analysis of elements in the data structure; page 6, paragraph [0065], page 7, paragraphs [0082]-[0083], page 8, paragraph [0089] and page 9, paragraph [0110]: after the analysis is complete, the content of the web document is passed to the transformer, which then reorganizes, summarizes, and removes information, where appropriate, from the hierarchical structure); and

a formatted document summarization process which generates summary information by selecting a plurality of summary entries from an electronic document based on differences in content formatting identified in the electronic document (page 3, paragraphs [0038]-[0041]: the web page (electronic document) is divided into several elements including headings, paragraphs, lists, separators, graphics, tables, table item, etc...and these are content properties, and the transformer uses analysis rule to categorize the elements).

11. As to independent claim 35, Reiley discloses a system which facilitates the communication of summary information for electronic documents to mobile communication device, comprising:

a server having a structured document summarization process which generates summary information by selecting a plurality of summary entries from an electronic document based on a predetermined content structure identified in the electronic document (page 2, paragraph [0015]: parsing a web document

(electronic document) to create a data structure comprised of hierarchical organization of elements and conducting analysis of elements in the data structure; page 6, paragraph [0065], page 7, paragraphs [0082]-[0083], page 8, paragraph [0089] and page 9, paragraph [0110]: after the analysis is complete, the content of the web document is passed to the transformer, which then reorganizes, summarizes, and removes information, where appropriate, from the hierarchical structure); and having a formatted document summarization process which generates summary information by selecting a plurality of summary entries from an electronic document based on differences in content formatting identified in the electronic document (page 3, paragraphs [0038]-[0041]: the web page (electronic document) is divided into several elements including headings, paragraphs, lists, separators, graphics, tables, table item, etc...and these are content properties, and the transformer uses analysis rule to categorize the elements; page 7, paragraph [0083]: the content transformer divides the content into discrete data pieces or fragments, the data pieces or organized (summarized) according to the transformed hierarchy, i.e., discrete piece of data could be a page of text that corresponds to a level from the transformed hierarchy, wherein the text represents a portion of the original web page); and

a wireless communication network which communicates the summary information to a mobile communication device in response to a request for the electronic document (Fig. 1 and page 9, paragraphs [0110]-[0111]: when the transformer completes its process, it passes the newly-structured hierarchical structure to a device specific generator which takes the hierarchical structure and

generates content that is configured to be displayed on the user device 100

(mobile communication device)).

12.   As to dependent claim 36, Reiley discloses a mobile communication

device which receives the summary information in response to the request for the

electronic document (Fig. 4 and page 7, paragraph [0082]).

13.   As to dependent claim 38, Reiley discloses the server having an

unstructured/unformatted document summarization process which generates

summary information by selecting a plurality of summary entries from an

electronic document based on differences in paragraph sizes in the electronic

document (page 7, paragraph [0082]: the hierarchical structure represents a

general summary or table of contents for the content of the web document

(electronic document); and page 3, paragraphs [0038]-[0041]: the web page

(electronic document) is divided into several elements including headings,

paragraphs, lists, separators, graphics, tables, table item, etc...and these are

content properties, and the transformer uses analysis rule to categorize the

elements).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to

be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15.   Claims 7, 17, 19-20, 22-25 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiley as applied to claims 1-5, 9-10, 28, 30-32, and 35-38 above, and further in view of Yalovsky et al. (Yalovsky), US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0073872.

16.   As to dependent claims 7, 17, and 34, Reiley, however, does not explicitly disclose wherein the act of analyzing the content structure or properties comprises identifying differences in paragraph alignments or indents in the electronic document.

Yalovsky discloses a mechanism for pasting data from a source document into a destination document with different format, the source document having multiple levels of the elements (paragraphs), which are aligned differently (Abstract and Fig. 4). Yalovsky also discloses that when pasting a selection from a source document into a destination document, the levels of elements (paragraphs) are maintained but the format is changed (Fig. 4 and pages 3-4, paragraphs [0031]-[0032]), thus this step implies identifying differences in paragraph alignments in the source document when pasting it to the destination document.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings Yalovsky and Reiley to include

analyzing the content structure or properties comprises identifying differences in paragraph alignments or indents in the electronic document so the pasting data from the source document into the destination document still maintains the same paragraph alignments but different formats.

17.   As to independent claim 19, Reiley discloses a computer implemented method of generating summary information for an electronic document, comprising:

identifying an electronic document for which to generate summary information having a plurality of summary entries (page 2, paragraph [0015]: parsing a web document (electronic document) to create a data structure comprised of hierarchical organization of elements and conducting analysis of elements in the data structure; page 6, paragraph [0065], page 7, paragraphs [0082]-[0083], page 8, paragraph [0089] and page 9, paragraph [0110]: after the analysis is complete, the content of the web document is passed to the transformer, which then reorganizes, summarizes, and removes information, where appropriate, from the hierarchical structure);

in the generation of the summary information:

if the electronic document has a predetermined content structure, selecting the plurality of summary entries from the electronic document based on the predetermined content structure (page 7, paragraph [0082]: the hierarchical structure represents a general summary or table of contents for the content of the web document (electronic document)); and

otherwise, if the electronic document has content properties, selecting the plurality of summary entries from the electronic document based on differences in the content properties (page 3, paragraphs [0038]-[0041]: the web page (electronic document) is divided into several elements including headings, paragraphs, lists, separators, graphics, tables, table item, etc...and these are content properties, and the transformer uses analysis rule to categorize the elements).

Reiley, however, does not explicitly disclose the content properties comprises paragraph alignments or indents.

Yalovsky discloses a mechanism for pasting data from a source document into a destination document with different format, the source document having multiple levels of the elements (paragraphs) which are aligned differently (Abstract and Fig. 4). Yalovsky also discloses that when pasting a selection from a source document into a destination document, the levels of elements (paragraphs) are maintained but the format is changed (Fig. 4 and pages 3-4, paragraphs [0031]-[0032]), thus this step implies identifying differences in paragraph alignments in the source document when pasting it to the destination document.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings Yalovsky and Reiley to include analyzing the content structure or properties comprises identifying differences in paragraph alignments or indents in the electronic document so the pasting data

from the source document into the destination document still maintains the same paragraph alignments but different formats.

18.   As to dependent claim 20, Reiley and Yalovsky disclose providing the summary information in response to a request for the electronic document by a mobile communication device (Reiley, Fig. 1 and page 9, paragraphs [0110]-[0111]: when the transformer completes its process, it passes the newly-structured hierarchical structure to a device specific generator which takes the hierarchical structure and generates content that is configured to be displayed on the user device 100 (mobile communication device)).

19.   As to dependent claim 22, Reiley and Yalovsky disclose wherein the act of analyzing the content structure or properties comprises identifying a table of contents in the electronic document (Reiley, page 7, paragraphs [0082]-[0083]).

20.   As to dependent claim 23, Reiley and Yalovsky disclose wherein the act of analyzing the content structure or properties comprises identifying a plurality of spreadsheet worksheets in the electronic document (Reiley, page 3, paragraphs [0038]-[0039] and page 5, paragraph [0057]).

21.   As to dependent claim 24, Reiley and Yalovsky disclose wherein the act of analyzing the content structure or properties comprises identifying a plurality of

document pages in the electronic document (Reiley, page 3, paragraphs [0038]-[0039]).

22.   As to dependent claim 25, Reiley and Yalovsky disclose wherein the act of analyzing the content structure or properties comprises analyzing text formatting in the electronic document (Reiley, pages 5-6, paragraphs [0063]-[0067]).

23.   Claims 8, 18, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiley as applied to claims 1-5, 9-10, 28, 30-32, and 35-38 above, and further in view of Bourbakis et al. (Bourbakis), US Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0145279.

24.   As to dependent claims 8, 18, and 29, Reiley, however, does not explicitly disclose wherein the act of analyzing the content structure or properties comprises identifying differences in paragraph sizes in the electronic document.

Bourbakis discloses a method for reconstructing new document from a group of old ones by analyzing paragraphs of the group to extract important statistical feature such as the size of the paragraphs in text characters (Abstract and page 2, paragraph [0024]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bourbakis and Reiley to include

identifying differences in paragraph sizes in the electronic document to remove the redundant text.

25.   Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiley and Yalovsky as applied to claims 7, 17, 19-20, 22-25 and 34 above, and further in view of Whitledge et al. (Whitledge), US Patent No. 6,925,595.

26.   As to dependent claims 26, Reiley and Yalovsky do not explicitly disclose wherein the act of analyzing the content structure or properties comprises analyzing at least one of text font names, text font sizes, text font weights, and text font styles in the electronic document.

Whitledge discloses converting electronic document for a PDA, the PDA display has less than SuperVGA resolution and is grayscale, the display font for the text displayed has been changed to Arial (col. 23, lines 1-29 and Figures 8A&8B).

Since Whitledge teaches a method and system for converting electronic data to display on a user device such as hand-held, wireless phone, PDA or other device, which is similar to the system for formatting network content into a device specific format (mobile phone) of Reiley and Yalovsky, thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Whitledge and Reiley and Yalovsky to include the act of analyzing the content structure or properties comprises analyzing at least one of text font names, text font sizes, text font weights, and text font styles in the

electronic document for the purpose of providing content conversion application

to convert electronic documents to match the capabilities of a user device or the

preferences of a user.

27.   Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Reiley and Yalovsky as applied to claims 7, 17, 19-20, 22-25 and 34 above, and

further in view of Bourbakis et al. (Bourbakis), US Patent Application Publication

No. US 2003/0145279.

28.   As to dependent claim 21, Reiley and Yalovsky, however, do not explicitly

disclose wherein the act of analyzing the content structure or properties

comprises identifying differences in paragraph sizes in the electronic document.

Bourbakis discloses a method for reconstructing new document from a

group of old ones by analyzing paragraphs of the group to extract important

statistical feature such as the size of the paragraphs in text characters (Abstract

and page 2, paragraph [0024]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Bourbakis and Reiley and

Yalovsky to include identifying differences in paragraph sizes in the electronic

document to remove the redundant text.

Response to Arguments

In the remarks, Applicant(s) argued in substance that

A) Reiley does not disclose the amended subject matter of claim 1 and 10, which is "wherein said generating document summary information includes determining if the electronic document has a predetermined content structure and in response selecting the plurality of summary entries from the electronic document based on the predetermined content structure; otherwise, if the electronic document has content properties, selecting the plurality of summary entries from the electronic document based on differences in the content properties."

In reply to argument A, Reiley discloses in page 2, paragraph [0017]: a content transformer transforms a Web document by performing an analysis of the elements of the Web document, the analysis taking into account a structural arrangement of the elements, and rearranges (summaries) the elements as a result of the analysis to generate a hierarchical data structure that represents the web document), and generates a user device format version of the web document based upon the hierarchical data structure; page 7, paragraph [0082]: the hierarchical structure represents a general summary or table of contents for the content of the web document (electronic document).   In addition, Reiley discloses in page 3, paragraphs [0038]-[0041]: the web page (electronic document) is divided into several elements including headings, paragraphs, lists, separators, graphics, tables, table item, etc...and these are content properties, and the transformer uses analysis rule to categorize the elements; page 7, paragraph [0083]: the content transformer divides the content into discrete data pieces or fragments, the data pieces or organized (summarized) according to the transformed hierarchy, i.e., discrete piece of data could be a page of text that

corresponds to a level from the transformed hierarchy, wherein the text represents a portion of the original web page.

B) There is no motivation to combine the teachings of Reiley and Yalovsky.

In reply to argument B, applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, Reiley discloses a system that transforms computer network content from one format into another format, which is similar to editing or formatting documents of Yalovsky. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings Yalovsky and Reiley to include analyzing the content structure or properties comprises identifying differences in paragraph alignments or indents in the electronic document so the pasting data from the source document into the destination document still maintains the same paragraph alignments but different formats.

C) There is no motivation to combine Reiley and Bourbakis.

In reply to argument C, applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be

established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce

the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to

do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally

available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5

USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941

(Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, In this case, Reiley discloses a system that transforms

computer network content from one format into another format, which is similar to

reconstructing (editing or formatting) new documents from old ones of Bourbakis.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Bourbakis and Reiley to include

identifying differences in paragraph sizes in the electronic document to remove

the redundant text.

D) Bourbakis does not teach a method wherein analysis of content properties

and content formatting may be used as an alternative to analysis of content

structure in order to generate content summaries.

In reply to argument D, the examiner does not use Bourbakis reference to

reject the limitation "a method wherein analysis of content properties and content

formatting may be used as an alternative to analysis of content structure in order

to generate content summaries". Instead, the examiner uses Reiley reference to

reject the above limitation. Please see claim 1 above.

E) "The assignee does not take a position regarding whether such elements (i.e., headings, paragraphs, lists, separators, graphics, tables, table items) are "content properties"."

In reply to argument E, although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Therefore, the examiner interprets headings, paragraphs, lists, separators, graphics, tables, and table items as broadly as content properties of a document or web content.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.   Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed

within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory

action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is

(571) 272-4092. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am – 5:30 pm

Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (571) 272-4136.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding

is assigned is 703-872-9306. On July 15, 2005, the Central Facsimile (FAX)

Number will change from 703-872-9306 to 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chau Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2176

Doug Hutton
Primary Examiner,
Technology Center 2100